



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## (2) NOUNS

*Bread and butter type*

aim and object	blood and breeding
arms and ensigns	blot and blunder
end and object	blows and buffets
back and belly	bone and breeding
back and body	boon and blessing
bag and baggage	boughs and branches
bags and boxes	box and barrel
bags and bundles	box and bottle
balls and banquets	brain and bosom
bands and banners	brake and brier
bed and bolster	broil and battle
beds and boxes	brooch and bracelet
bed and breakfast	broom and bracken
beef and biscuit	bumps and bruises
bit and bridle	bush and bramble
blight and blackness	bush and brier
blood and body	

*Butter and bread type*

adder and eel	body and brain
uncles and aunts	body and breast
banner and brand	bower and bed
blemish and blot	breeches and boots
body and bones	bullocks and beeves

Total in Willert 215 in first type; 48 in second type.

## (3) ADJECTIVES

*Bread and butter type*

old and ugly	cold and quiet
base and bloody	cool and cunning
base and brutal	cracked and crumpled
best and boldest	crisp and curly
best and bravest	damp and dirty
best and brightest	damp and dreary
big and burly	dark and deadly
bleak and barren	dark and dingy
bleak and bitter	dark and dirty
blithe and bonny	dark and dismal
blue and brilliant	dark and doubtful
bold and brilliant	dark and dreadful
brave and brilliant	dark and dreary
bright and balmy	dark and drizzly
bright and blooming	deep and dreamless
bright and busy	dim and dirty
brisk and busy	dim and dismal
calm and careless	dry and deadened
calm and cloudless	dry and dusty
clean and quiet	dull and dismal
clear and quiet	dull and dreamy
coarse and common	dull and dreary
coarse and cruel	dull and drowsy
cold and callous	faint and faded
cold and careless	faint and footsore
cold and clammy	fair and favoured
cold and cruel	fair and fertile

*Butter and bread type*

favoured and fat	feeble and faint
fearful and faint	feeble and few

Total in Willert 158 in first type; 15 in second type.

## (4) VERBS

*Bread and butter type*

bark and bellow	clothe and comfort
beat and batter	come and carry
beg and borrow	crouch and cower
bite and blister	fall and flutter
bleed and blister	fawn and flatter
blush and blunder	feast and fatten
boil and bubble	fit and furnish
brag and bluster	fix and fasten
bruised and bleeding	flash and flicker
buy and borrow	flush and fluster
catch and carry	flush and frighten

*Butter and bread type*

baffle and beat	flicker and fade
blossom and bear	flutter and flap

Total in Willert 64 in first type; 17 in second type.

*Summary:* Willert has a total of 538 of these phrases. In 454 of them the monosyllable precedes the dissyllable. We have then over 84 per cent. of the "bread and butter" type, and less than 16 per cent. of the "butter and bread" type. These percentages, it seems to me, justify Jespersen's statement, "the usual practice is to place the short word first," as far, at least, as the alliterating combinations are concerned.

JOHN WHYTE.

*New York University.*

## GINÉS PÉREZ DE HITA

*Guerras civiles de Granada, Primera Parte.*

Reproducción de la edición príncipe del año 1595, publicada por PAULA BLANCHARD-DEMOUGE. Madrid, Bailly-Baillière, 1913. 8vo., cxviii + a-n + 337 pp. Facsimile title-page. (Junta para ampliación de estudios é investigaciones científicas and Centro de estudios históricos.)

Here is a splendidly printed reproduction of the first edition of Hita's *Historia de los*

*Bandos de los Zegries y Abencerrajes*, edited by a former student of the Universities of Toulouse and Paris. It is provided with a long and important introduction, a bibliography of the early editions, comments on the style and syntax of Hita, a few variant readings, some historical notes, and a list of *Documentos relativos a los moros y a los reyes católicos en la época de sus conquistas en Andalucía y toma de Granada*. In importance the work transcends that of many reprints of first editions, and I shall try, in the limited space at my disposal, to set forth the points which require comment.

Let it be said at once that we have not here a critical text, but only a reprint, and with punctuation and accent modernized. For reasons soon to be stated, a complete list of variant readings from later editions is a physical impossibility. Just how perfect the reproduction is, one cannot say, without a comparison with the rare original; there is no *Fe de erratas* to betray a guilty conscience. But certain obvious mistakes suggest that the work of collation might have been better done, or, at least, that an attempt should have been made to correct the misprints of the original.<sup>1</sup>

It appears from the facts set forth in the *Bibliography* that the need of a reproduction of the first edition was greater than anyone suspected. The book was first printed at Saragossa, 1595,<sup>2</sup> and editions succeeded one an-

other rapidly, there being at least nine more within twenty years. But an edition published at Seville in 1613, and bearing upon the title-page "en esta ultima impression corregida y emendada" presented a version completely altered. According to the editress (p. xciii), no edition later than 1619 has followed that of Saragossa 1595; all the innumerable editions later than 1619 adopted the text of Seville 1613. Hence the prime importance of the present reprint.

The changes made in 1613 were not limited to a few word substitutions; they constituted a virtual rewriting of the whole book. The editress presents for comparison (pp. 317-320) nineteen variant passages from the edition of Seville 1613, but these convey only a feeble notion of the changes involved. Not only is syntax modernized, archaic words suppressed, adjectives and epic formulae excised,<sup>3</sup> whole sentences removed, but it is hardly an exaggeration to say that not a single sentence is left in its original form. It follows that those of us—practically all, I suppose,—who have read Hita only in a modern edition, such, for instance, as that edited by Aribau in vol. III of the Rivadeneyra collection of *Bibl. de Aut. esp.* (1847), have read something removed a thousand leagues from the original thought of the author. As a single example take this sentence (*Rivad.*, p. 527a, lines 5 and 4 from below): "La hermosa Galiana vivía libre de amor, y fué herida de amores de Hamete Sarracino, y con grande exceso." But in the text of Saragossa 1595 we read (p. 63, ll. 9-12): "La hermosa Galiana, que hasta aquella hora siempre avia sido libre de passion de amor, se halló tan presa de Hamete Sarrazino, y de su buena disposición

*Manuel du libraire*, and the point would hardly be worth mentioning, were it not that Fitzmaurice-Kelly, after giving the date of the first edition as 1595 in the first three editions of his *History of Spanish Literature* (English, Spanish, French), has, through a mere clerical error, returned to 1588 in the two recent ones (Paris and Madrid, 1913).

<sup>3</sup>Some brief notes are given on this matter, pp. xcv, xcvi. The most important single change in syntax is in the position of object pronouns, as, *para le matar*, *sin se lo merecer*, changed to *para matarle*, *sin merecérselo*, etc.

<sup>1</sup>For example: p. 200, line 3, *brolle* for *brote*; p. 253, l. 26, *este* for *esta*; l. 29, *desdicha* for *desdichada*; l. 36, *emplea* for *empleara*; p. 290, l. 12, *casa* for *cosa*; p. 291, l. 32, *al enojada*, (?), unintelligible. In the well-known *romance* on pages 252-3 (Wolf, *Primavera y flor*, no. 85a), the refrain is printed in the way that Byron took it: "¡Ay de mí, Alhama!" I don't know that this reading is quite impossible, but the "¡Ay de mi Alhama!" of most recent editors is more plausible.—The number of misprints in the *Introduction* does not increase one's faith in the accuracy of the text.

<sup>2</sup>A report that there was an edition of Alcalá 1588 found credence with some, in particular Durán, in the *Bibliography* of the *Romancero general* (vol. II, p. 688). It arose from a misprint, 1588 for 1598, in the *Catalogue de Soubise*, Paris, 1789. The mistake was pointed out as far back as Brunet's

y talle, que no sabía qué se hazer." This is a fair example of the alterations introduced, and of the way in which the reviser carried condensation to a point where the meaning became obscure, and the color lost. A poem of sixty-one lines in blank verse (cap. XVI, pp. 258-9) is omitted in Rivad., with little loss, it must be said. On the other hand, three moralizing digressions, obviously out of tune with the context, appear in Rivad. that are not to be found in the 1595 text.<sup>4</sup> The reader will have no difficulty in understanding that whatever critics have had to say regarding Hita's style<sup>5</sup> must be

fundamentally revised. In reality, the Castilian of the first edition is quite of its time, easy-going, loose in structure, full of unvarying epic formulae and enthusiastic adjectives; in short, unliterary and altogether charming. A certain sententious compression that one notes in the modernized text, disappears entirely. Words which are incomprehensible in Rivad. are found to be explained by a phrase which the reviser omitted. Acquaintance with the first version will increase Hita's fame, rather than diminish it; the book, as he first wrote it, is more naïve, more logical, and more picturesque.

Who was responsible for the rewritten version of 1613? Mlle. Blanchard-Demouge does not touch upon this problem. Would any editor make so free with so recent a book? It seems unlikely, especially if Hita was still living at that time, as is probable. Was it, like Tasso's *Gerusalemme conquistata*, an unhappy second-thought of the author's failing powers? Only a close comparison of all the early editions will bring light.

<sup>4</sup>Cap. IX, p. 533b; cap. X, p. 539a; cap. XVII, p. 587a. I do not know whether all of these are also in the 1613 text. Only the first is among the variant passages quoted by Blanchard-Demouge, but it is evident that her selection is limited. This brings me to an important question which the editress has done nothing to clear up. Did all the changes appear in the edition of Seville, 1613, or were some made prior to it, or were many introduced in the nineteenth century? Not being able to consult any editions earlier than that of 1847, I can do no more than point out certain details that demand investigation. Thus, the second edition, Valencia, 1597, is declared in the title-page to be "corregida y enmendada en esta segunda impresion," and one ought to know what changes were actually made then. The variations in the early editions escaped the notice of Menéndez y Pelayo, who laid them all to the account of a modernized text published by León Amarita (Madrid, 1833, 2 vols. 8vo.), for which, according to him, S. Estébanez Calderón was responsible. (See *Orígenes de la novela*, I, ccclxxxviii and ccclxxxix, note 1.) This text was copied by Aribau for the Rivadeneyra edition, if this last can be called an edition of anything, for it is full of the rankest blunders. Mlle. Blanchard-Demouge takes no cognizance whatever of any changes introduced in the 1833 edition, so that we are left to infer that all date back to 1613. This much is certain, that the nineteen extracts she presents from the text of 1613 are almost identical with the readings of Rivad. There are a few verbal variations, and one or two sentences appear in Rivad. which are found in 1595, but not in 1613. It will be seen that a critical text and a study of the different editions are badly needed. In my remarks about the disfiguration which the original underwent in 1613, I have assumed that the latter text is practically that of Rivad.

<sup>5</sup>Aribau, *B.A.E.*, vol. III, p. xxxvi, made some often-quoted remarks concerning the modernity of Hita's style.

The editress, not content with having restored her author to his pristine charm, endeavors to prove that he is guilty of none of the faults ascribed to him. Thus she quotes (p. xciv) an incomplete sentence from Menéndez y Pelayo (*Orígenes de la novela*, I, ccclxxx), who said: "su misma novela indica que no estaba muy versado en la lengua ni en las costumbres de los mahometanos, puesto que acepta etimologías ridículas, comete estupendos anacronismos, y llega a atribuir a sus héroes el culto de los ídolos ('un Mahoma de oro') y a poner en su boca reminiscencias de la mitología clásica." Menéndez y Pelayo was not fooled by the revised text, which he laid, as I have said (cf. *supra*, note 4), to the edition of Madrid, 1833. Not being able to deny the charge of anachronism (which she omits in her quotation), the editress concentrates upon the other points, and declares that "mitología, ídolos de oro y etimologías ridículas, todo eso no se encuentra en la edición de Zaragoza 1595; todo eso fué introducido más tarde en la edición de Sevilla, 1613." She is surprisingly mistaken in her statement; anyone who had

read the proof of her reprint must have known that the "Mahoma de oro" is mentioned on p. 89, l. 28, as well as p. 104, l. 18. The phrase "etimologías ridículas" refers, I suppose, to the origin which Hita offers in his first chapter for the names Elvira and Granada, and these are in the first edition as well as any other. Lastly, the "reminiscencias de la mitología clásica" abound, on the lips of the Moors, and in their fiestas. As examples I may cite: the entire song of Abenámbar, on p. 65; "el dios de amor," p. 84, l. 19; "el dios Marte," p. 99, ll. 13 and 25; and "Polyphemo" on the same page; "Diana," "Venus," "Troya," "Achiles," p. 159, ll. 13-15 (this passage is not in Riva-deneyra!); etc. So it is clear that Mlle. Blanchard-Demouge has spoken inadvisedly on this matter.

I come now to the two important points in the *Introduction*:<sup>6</sup> if the contentions of the editress be regarded as proved, the theories hitherto accepted are overthrown. The first deals with the identity of the "Moro coronista" from whom Hita claimed to obtain much of his material; the second, with the accuracy of the descriptions of fiestas and tourneys which lend brilliance to his narrative. Blanchard-Demouge goes counter to all former opinions by asserting that the element of truth is much greater than had been supposed.

The title-page of all the editions reads: "agora nuevamente sacado de un libro Arauigo, cuyo autor de vista (whatever that may mean) fue un Moro llamado Aben Hamin, natural de Granada." Hita, in the body of his work, mentions this Moor only once by name, in the third

chapter (p. 24, ll. 7 and 9): "el Moro Abenhamin, historiador de todos aquellos tiempos, dende la entrada de los Moros en España." But he speaks several times of the "Moro coronista" as his authority, and in chap. XVII (p. 291) gives an account of how he obtained the Arabic history: the Moorish writer lived at the time of the fall of Granada, and passed to Africa, where he died; a grandson of his found the history of Granada among his papers, and gave it to a Jew, Rabbi Santo [Sem Tob?], who, at the request of Rodrigo Ponce de León, translated it into Castilian; it was presented to Hita by this same Ponce de León (whose friend he really was).

Every critic who has discussed Hita has taken for granted that this supposed Moorish source was a literary fiction, in the same category with Cervantes' Cide Hamete Benengeli.<sup>7</sup> But Mlle. Blanchard-Demouge declares (pp. xxx-xl) that such a Moor existed, that his name was Aben Aljatib, and that Hita obtained material from him, although the story of the passage of the manuscript from Africa to Spain is probably made up. Let us examine her proof.

In the Second Part of his *Guerras civiles* (chap. X, Rivad. p. 616b) Hita speaks of the capture of Ohanez having been prophesied by "aquel moro viejo, celebre sabio de Granada, llamado Aben Hamin, el mismo que por el ruego del Rey don Pedro de Castilla declaró los pronósticos de Merlín." This Moor was a well-known personage, called in the Castilian chronicles Aben Hatin; he lived 1313-1372, and wrote a famous series of letters to princes, and a history of Granada and its principal men, "conocida bajo el nombre de Jhata."<sup>8</sup> This history was continued by successors of Ibn al-Khatib, and brought down to 1489. Hita's

<sup>6</sup>The *Introducción* is divided into the following sections: I, *Interés de la obra*; II, *Biografía de Ginés Pérez de Hita*; III, *El poema épico de Lorca, primer borrador de las "Guerras civiles"*; IV, *Fuentes históricas*; V, *Romances de las Guerras*; VI, *Ficción. Incidentes novelescos. Relaciones de fiestas*. There follows the *Bibliografía*, including an account of Hita's sale of his ms., remarks on his language and style, and a list of the editions of the *Primera Parte*, both in Spain and outside, giving in many cases the text of the title-page, the *Aprobación*, *Licencia* and *Tassa*. Two French translations are described at length; and two more French ones, one English and one German, are mentioned summarily.

<sup>7</sup>For example, Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *Hist. de la litt. esp.*, Paris, 1913, p. 322; Menéndez y Pelayo, *Orígenes de la novela*, I, cccxxx: "Nadie puede tomar por lo serio el cuento del original arábigo de su obra."

<sup>8</sup>In the conventional Arabic notation for English, his name was Ibn al-Khatib, and the full title of his work "Al-ihâta fi târikhi Gharnâta," that is "the circle about the history of Granada."

information about the cities in the kingdom of Granada and the chief Moorish families differs from that of the Christian chroniclers he used; "más bien parece proceder de . . . el prólogo de la *Jhata*" (p. xxxiv).

What is to be said of this important (if true) identification of the "Moro coronista"? Simply that it is very interesting, but very far from proven. We may pass over the phonetic changes involved in the passage from Ibn al-Khatīb to Aben Hamīn, which do not seem impossible; we might refrain from pointing out that Hita himself does not claim that the Aben Hamīn of the Second Part who prophesied the fall of Ohanez and lived in the days of Pedro el cruel, is the same as the Aben Hamīn of the first part, who fled to Africa after the fall of Granada (since this last story is probably pure fiction). But there is no overlooking the fact that Mlle. Blanchard-Demouge has not presented an atom of positive proof that Hita derived information from the preface to the *Jhata*. The obvious and valuable thing to do was to include copious citations from Ibn al-Khatīb in support of her argument, with a translation for the benefit of the lay reader. But she has done nothing of the kind; indeed one may infer from the vagueness of her remarks concerning this Moorish author that she lacks first-hand acquaintance with him. She does not even tell us where we could consult him, if we were able;<sup>9</sup> we must turn to Pons Boigues' *Ensayo biobibliográfico sobre los historiadores y geógrafos árabigos españoles*, Madrid, 1898, no. 294, or, more recent, to Dozy's *Spanish Islam*, translated by Stokes, London, 1913, p. 744, to learn that *al-ihâta* exists in mss. of the Escorial, Paris, the Gayangos collection, and Tunis, and that it has never yet been printed, let alone translated.<sup>10</sup> Such being the case, is it in irony that the editress remarks (p. 321, l. 19) "Sobre la fundición de Granada, véase IBU (sic) ALJATIB: pró-

logo a la *Jatha*" (sic)? Why, if Hita had a contemporary Moorish source at hand, did he invent the strange anachronism of the slaughter of the Abencerrages by Boabdil, when it was the father of the Rey Chico who killed them? Menéndez y Pelayo's explanation of the origin of this legend is all-sufficient (*Orígenes de la novela*, I, cclxxxiii ff.). Moreover, Blanchard-Demouge herself points out that Hita cites the Moor as his authority for one passage which he borrowed directly from Pulgar (cf. p. xxxvii), which proves well enough that his statements have no intrinsic claim to belief. All in all, it will require direct comparison with the text of Ibn al-Khatīb to prove that Hita owes him anything at all.

The other new point which Mlle. Blanchard-Demouge attempts to make is that the descriptions of fiestas at Granada, with their tourneys, emblems, devices and elaborate apparatus, is not so fantastic as has generally been assumed (see *Introducción*, chap. VI). Menéndez y Pelayo, although declaring that these gallant Moors were largely conventional, and lent themselves to caricature, qualified his remark by noting that Christian customs had penetrated the Moorish kingdoms toward their close, and that Hita's descriptions might not be true in detail, but they were faithful to the spirit of the decadent capital, torn by tribal feuds (*Orígenes de la novela*, I, cclxxxvi and cclxxxix). Mlle. Blanchard-Demouge attempts to show that even the details can be verified; that the "marlotas, alquiceles, zambras y saraos" were not catchwords, but were actually used in contemporary accounts.

What she really proves are the following points: (1) that tournaments and *pasos honrosos* were common among the Christians in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; (2) that elaborate fiestas, with allegorical "floats" built to represent serpents, etc., after the fashion described by Hita, were often held in the second half of the sixteenth century; (3) that the triple tunic (*marlota, albornoz, alquicel*), of which de Circourt made sport, declaring any Moor would suffocate who wore so many clothes under a Southern sun, and the *adarga*, plumes

<sup>9</sup> Merely by chance, when on another subject, she refers to a MS. of the *Jhata* at the Escorial, no. 357 (p. lxxv, note 4).

<sup>10</sup> For further information see the third edition of Dozy's *Recherches* I, 282-284, and the same writer's *Script. Arab. loci de Abbadidis*, II, 169-172.

and bright colors, were the fashion and in current use for Christian tourneys toward 1600 (1570, 1605, 1559, etc.); (4) that Moors, dressed in native costume, took part in Christian fiestas and *juegos de cañas* in 1570 and 1571 (though the quotation leaves a doubt whether they were not Spaniards playing the part); (5) that there were duels and tournaments in Granada in the last days of the kingdom (this is the point least well supported by documents); (6) that the Moors used coats of arms with mottoes and devices, and knew the symbolism of colors; (7) that the chivalric spirit of the Moors and their respect for women were much the same as that known among the Christian warriors.

If the documents cited, of the authority of some of which one would like to know more, do not prove, rigorously speaking, anything except that Hita described the gallants and fiestas of his own time, at least they make it appear probable that similar gallants lived and similar splendid pageants were staged in the Granada of Muley-Hassan and Boabdil. But Hita's alleged accuracy was fortuitous; there is no likelihood that he knew or desired correct local color.

Of the remainder of the *Introduction* there is not space to say much,—nor is it necessary. Chap. II brings no new facts of importance to our knowledge of Hita's life, although it seems more thorough than any previous treatment. The date and place of his birth, the date of his death, are still unknown. Chap. III analyzes at some length Hita's extensive narrative poem in octava rima, *Libro de la población y hazañas de la M. N. y M. L. ciudad de Lorca*, which was freely used by Father Morote for his *Antigüedad y blasones de la ciudad de Lorca* (1741). The editress speaks of "el único manuscrito que se conoce" of this poem, but does not tell us, what is nevertheless the case, that it was published entire by Acero y Abad in his *Ginés Pérez de Hita*, Madrid, 1889. She lays stress upon the fact that in many ways this epic forecasts the methods used by Hita in the *Guerras civiles*; it contains detailed descriptions of fiestas, and even a *romance*, of which so many were inserted in the novel. In Chap. IV are dis-

cussed, beside the supposed Arabic sources that I have already mentioned, Hita's debts to Spanish chroniclers and to some other less certain helpers. The books that he used most, and referred to plainly, were Hernando del Pulgar's *Crónica de los reyes católicos* (1565) and Garibay y Zamalloa's *Compendio histórico de las crónicas*, etc. (1571) (see pp. xl-l). Chap. V takes up seriatim the 34 romances which Hita weaves into his narrative, and their sources. 20 of them are not found in exactly the same form anywhere else, and of the 20 most do not exist at all in any of the other old collections. In this class are such important poems as the Battle of the Alporchones (Wolf, *Primavera y flor*, no. 81), the famous ballad on the loss of Alhama (*ibid.*, no. 85a), the exploit of Garcilaso de la Vega with the Moor who had tied the Ave María to his horse's tail (*ibid.*, no. 93)<sup>11</sup> and "Mira, Zaide, que te aviso," the best-known of all *romances moriscos* (Durán, *Rom. gen.*, no. 56). Merely as a collector and preserver of good ballads, Hita deserves our gratitude. Did Hita compose any of these himself? We do not know, but it seems most probable that he received many, the ones he calls "antiguos," at least, directly from tradition, which he had excellent opportunity to know. Of those found in previous collections, only four come from the early ones, the *Cancionero de romances* 'sin año,' the *Silva* of 1550, Timoneda's *Rosa española* (1573); the rest are all taken from Pedro de Moncayo's *Flor de varios romances nuevos* (1589). These last are the *rs. moriscos artísticos* which Hita expanded into the romantic episodes of Zaide and Zaida, of Gazul and Lindaraja, etc.; he then quotes the poems as evidence in support of his fables! Menéndez y Pelayo had already pointed out this ingenious system (*Orígenes de la novela*, I, cclxxxi).<sup>12</sup>

The *Bibliography* proper (pp. xcvi-cxviii)

<sup>11</sup> The editress states that this poem is found in Moncayo's collection, mentioned below, but neither Wolf nor Menéndez y Pelayo mention the fact, if it be true.

<sup>12</sup> The only romantic digression not found in *romances* published before the *Guerras civiles* is that of the Sultana accused of adultery, and defended by four Christian knights. Hita probably composed the

is intended to be complete for editions of the *Primera Parte*, or at least down to the nineteenth century, and includes foreign editions as well as those of Spain. I may point out that the following editions given by Salvá in his *Catálogo* (II, 172) are not included in Blanchard-Demouge's list: Lisbon, 1616; Barcelona, 1619; Gotha, 1805. Yet the edition of Barcelona 1619 is mentioned on p. xciii in another connection.

On the same page (xciii) the editress speaks of a particular edition of the *Segunda Parte*, Barcelona, 1619, which Wolf (*Studien*, 1859, p. 334, note 3) describes, but which she has sought in vain to discover, although she has had the librarians at Vienna and Munich hunting for it. If she scrutinized the words of Wolf with more care, she might have spared herself and the librarians some trouble. It is the edition of Cuenca 1619, not Barcelona, that he is describing the while, and it corresponds exactly to the edition of that place and date known to the editress.

The concluding list of *Documentos* (pp. 329-337) gives evidence of wide reading. It is to be regretted that here, as elsewhere, a lack of precision in reference is evidenced which would render it difficult to run down some of the works mentioned.<sup>13</sup>

story and the poems that accompany it. While speaking of *romances*, I ought not to pass entirely over that beginning "Ya te veo, Lorca mía,—la por mí tan deseada," which is inserted, not in the *Guerras civiles*, but in Canto XI of the epic on the city of Lorca (cf. p. xxiii). It has never been printed in any of the modern collections of *romances*, and offers interesting resemblances to some of the old ballads. Thus: "O Lorca, cuanto le cuestas—a este Reyno de Granada;" cf. no. 101 of Wolf's *Prim. y flor*: "¡O ciudad, cuánto me cuestas—por la gran desdicha mía!" One should compare also nos. 55 and 129 in the same collection. It is likely that Hita composed it himself, in spite of its apparent traditional ring.

<sup>13</sup> Many such inaccuracies have been noted in the course of this article. I must not fail to correct the statement (p. liv, l. 8) that the *Cancionero de romances* 'sin año' was later than 1550. It was, of course, earlier than 1550.—The quotations which the editress makes from the text of the *Guerras civiles*, on p. xxx, l. 25, xxxi, l. 3, and xxxi, l. 14, follow the Rivadeneyra version instead of her own!

To sum up, the inspiration of this reprint is most happy, and scholars have every reason to be grateful for a reproduction of the primitive text of the *Bandos de los Zegries y Abencerrages*. The editress shows an original turn of thought, and acquaintance with many an unusual book. It is a pity that these qualities were not accompanied by greater accuracy and a more critical judgment. A scholarly account of the different versions of Ibn al-Khatib's *al-ihâta*, and generous translations from it, would have been invaluable. As it is, even the text cannot be called definitive, and the conclusions arrived at in the *Introduction* will have to be sifted well before they can be accepted.

Nothing is said which would lead one to suppose that the editress contemplates reprinting also the *Segunda Parte* of Hita's *Guerras civiles*. It is greatly to be hoped that she will do so. The text of the Second Part has suffered, according to Menéndez y Pelayo (*Orígenes*, I, cccclxxxviii) even more than that of the First Part, in modern editions. The Second Part has never hit the popular fancy, like the first, and has been, in fact, unduly neglected. The present generation, with its fondness for the actual and its aversion to works of the imagination, ought to revel in Hita's vivid descriptions of the Moriscos at bay, and ought to esteem his sympathy, extraordinary at that date, for the defeated enemies of his race.

S. GRISWOLD MORLEY.

*University of California.*

---

*The Cambridge History of English Literature.*  
Vol. XI: *The Period of the French Revolution.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914.

The characteristics of earlier volumes of this work reappear in the latest instalment. There is the same lack of complete co-ordination and proportion that one has been led to expect and that is, perhaps, the inevitable result of works